

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/016,549 | LAI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Alexander Jamal | 2643 | |

All Participants:

(1) Alexander Jamal.

(2) Thomas J. Onka (reg. number 42053).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 August 2005

Time: 12pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

17

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner suggested an amendment to claim 17 in order to more clearly define the invention. Applicant agreed and the claim was amended via examiner's amendment.

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)